

LAW OFFICES OF
RUDY, EXELROD, ZIEFF & LOWE, L.L.P.
351 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 700
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104
(415) 434-9800

DAVID A. LOWE (SBN: 178811)
JOHN T. MULLAN (SBN: 221149)
RUDY, EXELROD, ZIEFF & LOWE, L.L.P.
351 California Street, Suite 700
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 434-9800
Facsimile: (415) 434-0513
Email: dal@rezlaw.com
Email: jtm@rezlaw.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff,
MATTHEW DWYER

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MATTHEW DWYER
Plaintiff,

Case No. C 07-02309-JSW

vs.

**JOINT STIPULATION OF
DISMISSAL**

DYNETECH CORP., DYNETECH
SERVICES CORP., TELLEGENIX
CORPORATION (formerly known as LIFE
SKILLS CORPORATION),

AND ORDER THEREON

Defendants.

/

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a), and by stipulation of counsel for all parties who have appeared in the action, Plaintiff-Appellant Matthew Dwyer hereby dismisses the above-captioned action with prejudice as to all claims and causes of action, each party to bear its own fees and costs. The parties request that the court retain jurisdiction over the parties to enforce the settlement until performance in full of the terms of the settlement.

///

///

///

LAW OFFICES OF
RUDY, EXELROD, ZIEFF & LOWE, L.L.P.
351 CALIFORNIA STREET, SUITE 700
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94104
(415) 434-9800

IT IS SO STIPULATED:

Dated: March 2, 2009

Dated: March 2, 2009

/S/ Thomas K. Hockel

Thomas K. Hockel, Esq.
KELLY, HOCKEL & KLEIN, P.C.
44 Montgomery St., Suite 2500
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: (415) 951-0535

/S/ David A. Lowe

David A. Lowe
Patrice L. Goldman
RUDY EXELROD, ZIEFF & LOWE, LLP
351 California Street, Suite 700
San Francisco, California 94104
Telephone: (415) 434-9800

Attorneys for Defendants-Appellees
DYNETECH CORP., DYNETECH
SERVICES CORP., TELLEGENIX
CORPORATION (FORMERLY
KNOWN AS LIFE SKILLS
CORPORATION),

Attorneys for Plaintiff-Appellant MATTHEW
DWYER

The Court does not have a copy of the Settlement and, therefore, has no basis to evaluate whether or for how long it should retain jurisdiction over the parties. Accordingly, the request to retain jurisdiction over the parties is DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE to a showing that the Court should do so.

March 2, 2009

